



Special Committee on Targeting Resources

MEETING NOTICE

**Sacramento Employment and Training Agency
925 Del Paso Boulevard, Shasta Room
Sacramento, CA**

Lawrence Gotlieb
Chair

Christine Essel
Vice Chair

**Tuesday, September 12, 2006
10:00 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.**



Arnold Schwarzenegger
Governor

Brian McMahon
Executive Director

AGENDA

- 1. Welcome and Opening Remarks**
 - **Barry Sedlik, Chair**
- 2. Action - Approval of the April 18, 2006, Meeting Summary**
- 3. Discussion - Final Report on Minimum Wage Workers Initiative**
- 4. Presentation and Discussion - Labor Market Information**
 - **Janet Maglinte - California Regional Economies Project**
 - **Bonnie Graybill - Labor Market Information Division**
- 5. Action - Policy Framework for Strategic Partnerships in Workforce Investment**
- 6. Action - Coordination of Grant Applications with Local Boards**
- 7. Public Comment**
- 8. Next Steps**
- 9. Other Business that May Come Before the Committee**

Meeting conclusion time is an estimate; meeting may end earlier subject to completion of agenda items and/or approved motion to adjourn.

In order for the Special Committee to provide an opportunity for interested parties to speak at the public hearings, public comment may be limited. Written comments provided to the Special Committee must be made available to the public, in compliance with the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, §11125.1, with copies available in sufficient supply.

Individuals who require accommodations for their disabilities (including interpreters and alternate formats) are requested to contact the California Workforce Investment Board staff at (916) 324-3425 at least ten days prior to the meeting. TTY line: (916) 324-6523. Please visit the California Workforce Investment Board website at <http://www.calwia.org> or contact Danny Patterson for additional information.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

- **Barry Sedlik, Chair**

Action: Approval of April 18, 2006 Meeting Summary

**California Workforce Investment Board
Targeting Resources Committee
April 18, 2006 Meeting Summary**

California Workforce Investment Board (State Board) Members and Committee Members Attending

Barry Sedlik, Chair
Mike Curran, Vice Chair
Wayne Schell
Tim Galloway for Jerry Butkiewicz
Dwight Nixon
Judy Chen-Lee for Mayor Pulido

Board Staff, Partner Staff and Contributors Attending:

Partner Staff:

Michelle Alford-Williams, Department of Rehabilitation
Cindy Escott, Department of Rehabilitation
Marsha Yamamoto, Employment Development Staff
Al Tweltridge, Department of Education

State Board Staff:

Brian McMahon, Executive Director
Daniel Patterson
Joelle Hurst
John Bohart
Suzette Smith
Beverly Odom

Welcome and Opening Remarks

The meeting convened at 10:10 a.m., chaired by Chair, Barry Sedlik. He provided the meeting logistics information to the members and the public and stated that there would be an opportunity for the public to make comments and then reviewed the agenda Items.

Item 1: Approval of previous meeting minutes:

Mr. Sedlik announced that the Committee did not have a quorum and therefore is not able to vote on any of the action Items, but that the Committee staff would poll members to determine their vote for passing of the previous meeting minutes. The staff polled the members until a quorum was met. One additional vote was needed; that vote was provided by Mr. Villarino.

Item 2: Committee Short- and Long-Term Goals

This discussion Item was introduced by Mr. Sedlik by stating that the Committee has the desire to stay focused and limit our effort on a narrow set of issues and strategies. The list was compiled by staff going through prior meeting minutes, Committee parking lot issues and the WIA State Plan. The members have been polled and the task today is to identify the top three priorities. Mr. Curran added that as part of his responsibility to represent the local Workforce Investment Boards (local boards) as being part of this committee, he sent a survey out to the 50 workforce boards in California, 31 of which responded and he provided the results. He also stated that Item 9 (to increase the amount of funding available within our system) actually got the most votes, but was not identified as a high priority.

There were a couple of questions about the voting and the form used to present the results. Mr. McMahon stated that from a staff perspective, what we would hope to get out of this today would be the Committee looking at the issue areas and those identified as high priority among Committee members. Staff would then go back and try and take these broad issues and develop some specific recommendations back to the Committee for initiatives we may pursue in Committee. After this meeting, staff would look at this language and begin to narrow it down to specific actions and direction.

Mr Sedlik asked that those that may require special funding, how are we going to reconcile the things that we can do now versus things that would require more resources. Mr. McMahon responded by stating that is the case with all of these initiatives. We try and apply a matrix test, looking at resources necessary to implement it, partners, outcomes, time range, so if an initiative requires funding, as does the minimum wage initiative, that it can be an issue that can be discussed as the Committee goes ahead: what types of resources, how much, the funding mechanism that might be appropriate. Mr. Curran continued to explain the ranking of issues.

Mr. Curran said that polling shows Item 7 ranked as the top priority. Mr. Schell stated that a lot of this is improving the system and is one way to improve the use of resources that are already out there. There is still a lot of fear on the part of workforce system partners, and making this a priority can help us move the system to being a more complete resource. For instance, LMI is currently providing more and better data locally. Mr. Nixon said that the One Stops he has seen, that are thriving, have a close link to ED and is a more vibrant environment. From a business perspective, this is the type of environment he would like to see.

Ms. Chen mentioned the delicate balance of working with several systems (WIA, Social Services, ED) all being different, and helping to find a balance to working between and linking these systems. One way is to review and maybe emulate successful models currently in place in local communities. She also spoke about the possibility of looking to what extent there are equitable sharing of the costs for supporting the local systems.

Mr. Curran said that what we are really talking about is not creating partnerships among those specifically identified within the issue, but it is how we can make the One Stop better to create partnerships around that. The intent is how to use the current system to forge better alliances, how can the One Stop be a place of convergence, to embody partnerships in the community in a better way. What follows is what assets do you bring and how are they shared equitably. Mr. Sedlik said, in terms of how to structure this, is there something that might be intended as an incentive, and is not perceived as another bureaucratic obstacle in getting things done, but encouraging rather than creating more problems?

Mr. Bohart stated that from a staff perspective this is not a new issue. Each of the four Committees are looking at it. We have some capacity to go back, do some exploration, and then represent it in a form that the Committee can work with, and have some additional dialogue about it. From a process stand-point, is there a recommendation for a more specific activity, is there a means to measure the activity with the matrix (define the initiative), can the committee achieve a measurable outcome through an initiative? Then have discussions around whether we have narrowed it enough for the Committee and if it is something we can move forward with. Mr. Curran proposed rephrasing the issues as: How can One Stops become more catalytic in creating partnerships or alliances with assets or entities that can make in a difference in workforce development.

Mr. Curran then explained that the second Item for local boards is Item 9: increase funding to local boards. There is an expanding expectation but decreasing dollars they influence or have control over. This is what worries the locals on a daily basis. Mr. Schell said one way is to not look at a single effort but perhaps evaluate and engage foundations that are interested in the sort of work we have been performing. Mr. Curran said that the local level has the ability to identify local resources, local associations, and as the state becomes more involved in this, they have less access to them. One of the things the state has not been very good at doing is growing the resources for workforce development. He stated that we wait and resolve a problem based on circumstance, but don't change our system. The state could play a stronger role in advocating how many resources we have available at the local level. This effort is more than just the redirection of WIA 15% funding, but increasing the investment:

Mr. Curran stated that from the local boards polling the next priority is around labor market information: Items 2 and 10 "how to generate local information, how do you figure out what helps people target jobs that will be there tomorrow. " I think people voting for Item 4, are voting for same thing but other side of the coin – How do you figure out what industries are important, and where are your workforce needs. Maybe put these two together, what strategy can we use to accomplish this, but really how do we generate better information around job opportunities and nurturing the industries that are the drivers of your economy. Cluster those for the purposes of our conversation. Mr. Schell said that issues 1, 2, 3, and 10 all sort of come together, improving data. Items 4, 5, and 7 are really about connecting workforce partnerships and suggested 4 and 7 are the same activity and Item 5 is just a one-time effort/function of the Board. Mr. Curran stated that based on its rating it shows that this issue has been on the table for some time. He agreed that it could be one time statement and would only be effective on Solicitation for Proposals for WIA dollars.

The other contender for local boards is Item 5. The voting on this one reflects how difficult it is to run local systems when the investment points don't involve the local boards in the process. A lot of stuff maybe totally contrary to the place the local boards are trying to move the system.

Mr. Sedlik asked about the confidentiality issue with the access of data. Mr. McMahon said the CWIB is currently working with the Economic Strategy Panel and the Regional Economies Project to customize the data, a lot of interest to refine and how best to be used at the local level. There could be a feed in from this effort into the work of the Committee to expand the growth of these opportunities. Mr. McMahon stated that CWIB will continue to be involved in this and at some point we would come back to the Committee and make some recommendation to expand this project.

Mr. Sedlik asked Mr. Curran to summarize the discussion down to two priorities: Item number 7 and 9. There was no opposition from the members to this ranking. Mr. Sedlik asked if there was any additional discussion from members or the public. Mr. Curran continued that the one laying in wait is around combining #2 and 10. This issue was highly important, and not to lose sight of it as it is important to both sides. We will drive our actions around these two issue priorities, and as there is some low hanging fruit that we can take advantage of with LMI data, we will. There were no comments from the public. The discussion was closed.

Item 4: Conflict of Interest.

Mr. Sedlik introduced this Item by stating that this issue was raised at earlier meetings by the members of the Committee as they may be perspective bidders on the RFP. To ensure the concerns of the members were addressed the CWIB staff investigated this question. Mr. Patterson said that CWIB staff had reviewed Attorney General Decisions as well as Fair Political Practices Commission Decisions in this area. Since the Committee is forming recommendations and policies to inform a funding category, not actually scoring or evaluating the individual proposals or making recommendations as to whom the successful offerers are, CWIB feels that there is no conflict for the members in this activity. Mr. McMahon stated that there are AG guideline documents that were consulted in this instance, and legal counsel was available to consult in a specific instance. No further discussion or questions were asked.

Item 5: Minimum Wage Worker Initiative.

Mr. Sedlik provided a brief introduction and history of the effort to date on this initiative. Mr. Patterson referred the members to the handout in their folders, which contained the recommendations of the workgroup. He explained that the workgroup membership included representatives from CWIB, Department of Rehabilitation, Employment Development Department, Labor and Workforce Development Agency, and local area representatives acting in consulting roles. The Committee's action today is the last step before the staff work with EDD to define this category.

First category: eligible applications. Mr. Curran said that past practice has been to award bonus points to those applications that had expansive partnerships. His experience is that it is pretty easy to develop partnerships but are not very real, but another effort to develop partnerships that can demonstrate collaboration and breadth of the partnership. We do not want to discourage a singular player who can deliver a good program, but also want to encourage partnerships to form around this effort. In view of Mr. Curran's point, the recommendation is that bonus points be awarded to those applications with "demonstrated" partnerships. Mr. Galloway agreed with this point. No further comments from members.

Coordination with local boards: Applications should demonstrate that attempts were made to coordinate with local boards: Mr. Schell asked in what form the local Economic Development Councils were included in this process. Mr. Patterson responded that when the staff was discussing this, we recognized that a lot of the boards have EDC as a member, so our thoughts were that they would be a partner already. Mr. McMahon said that there are two ways we can deal with this. The first is to award points for applications that have EDC as a partner, the other is to require coordination with EDC, but these would require Committee discussion and recommendation. Mr. Curran said these two options are different. One is the local boards being responsible for systems building in the whole community. EDCs brings a certain set of assets and focus to that, but doesn't think those in his area would be interested in a low wage initiative.

Mr. Sedlik said that there could be competing proposals, what this says is we only want one proposal from each local area. It seems that this would discourage multiple proposals from different entities. Is this the intent or is this an unexpected consequence? Mr. Patterson stated that one of the aims of the workgroup was to communicate to the local provider community that the state was looking for locals to forge expansive partnerships around this effort. There may be many ideas locally, but we felt it necessary to have local boards as a partner, so this is an unintended consequence of having this coordination with the local boards. Ms. Chen also said that this could become a problem administratively if you have one local board essentially coordinating all the providers in the area. Tim Galloway agreed with Ms. Chen by saying that in many instances, local boards are a competitor and this represents too much area for potential conflict. There is also some concern about the timing to coordinate and present a proposal to the local board because of their meeting schedules.

Mr. Sedlik stated that the way this is worded, the Item is to require coordination, but the recommendation is to be able to demonstrate coordination. Mr. Galloway said that we need to define what demonstrate means. Mr. Patterson said one of the Items identified during our literature review and discussions with local representatives were there seemed to be some benefit

to having this coordination. The staff will work to provide language in the SFP that can be a basis for demonstrating attempts to coordinate with the local workforce board.

Employers as a mandatory partner: Mr. Bohart said that the employer partner should contribute to the project, whether as the one who employs these workers, or might be providing in kind contributions, time off to attend training, could be cash contributions. Mr. Sedlik asked what an employer is - could it be an industry trade association do they qualify or more narrowly defined as just someone who employs workers? Mr. Curran said we need to clarify what an employer is.

Ms. Chen said when we talk about employer contributions, are we recommending a specific amount of match? Mr. Patterson said that when we look at the cost of running a program like this, and looking at the limited amount of funding for this project, there will be a need for a cash match. The workgroup did not recommend a specific amount, because we want the applicant to be able to tell us what it will take, both in terms of match and in kind, to run this program and what resources they will bring to the table to meet this need.

The Committee agreed with the staff recommendation to encourage partnerships with local social services agencies and organized labor, but no additional points would be included specifically for their involvement in the partnership. There were not any discussions on the amount of award or a recommendation for a specific amount of match to be required of applicants. The Committee agreed on the awarding of bonus points for those industries that are identified in the research, and are targeted by the applicant.

There was some discussion about the benefits of recommending a demonstration project over one with standard performance measures and some discussion around the proposed measurements. Mr. Bohart summarized it by saying we could view these as guidelines for developing performance goals, what you are suggesting is that there may be some additional work to be done but to staff can now go back and begin to implement this effort with EDD. Mr. Curran said the goal is more money, but not as a result of more hours, what we want to achieve is increased hourly wage.

Mr. Tweltridge said that our very first action to open it up to all potential applicants rather than to just partnerships is sort of off message and inconsistent with everything thing else that we do. It sends up false hopes to those not part of a partnership. Mr. Sedlik responded that partnerships are key, but that those who have another proposal might have a unique way to serve this population. The point is well taken and the focus is to encourage partnerships, but the Committee didn't want to exclude those efforts or proposals that might be innovative.

Item 6: Committee Initiative Assessment tool.

Mr. Patterson stated that in the previous meeting there was some initial discussion regarding the Committee Initiative Assessment tool CWIB developed to define initiatives. Members had received a copy and wanted to provide additional opportunity to provide some input or suggest refinements. Mr. Curran suggested a brief description/narrative and origin of the initiative. He also suggested what role or steps the Committee should take, (review and approve, work with the constituents). Do we need a metrics, when we describe an outcome, how we should measure the outcomes, move completion box next to outcomes. There were no further comments. The staff will take the recommendations and modify the form accordingly.

Item 7: CALED and CMTA survey results

Mr. Patterson informed members that during the previous meeting, the Business and Industry presented its effort to conduct a joint survey with CALED and CMTA of their constituents. The results of this survey are included as handouts in the members' folders and are also available on the CWIB website. No additional information was shared or questions asked.

Next Steps:

Staff will begin to fill out the matrixes for next meeting,

The next meeting is scheduled for June 27, at 10:00 at the SETA offices in Sacramento.

No additional public comment.

Meeting adjourned at 1230.

Discussion – Final Report on Minimum Wage Worker Initiative

This is the final report for this Committee Initiative. The Committee authorized the formation of a staff working group to develop language to inform a state's spending priority under the Advancing Workers category. This priority is included in the Governor's WIA 15% Discretionary 2006/2007 Solicitation for Proposal (SFP). This item summarizes the Committee's work, its recommendations, and the language included in the SFP.

Minimum Wage Worker Summary Report

Scope

Up to \$1.5 million to target incumbent workers, between the ages of 25-54 years old, non-student, who has no more than a high school education or equivalent, and are consistently employed at the statutory minimum wage.

The Committee recommended maximum awards of \$400,000 each. At the time of this decision, the amount of funding was not firm and this recommendation was based in part on the information available at the time. The Governor has allocated \$1.5 million for this priority category. Therefore, the maximum award will be increased to \$500,000 to ensure that sufficient seed monies is provided to the successful bidders and the funds allocated by the Governor for this project are used to the fullest extent.

Definition of Chronic

The workgroup provided an initial recommendation that defined consistently-employed as those workers with at least 5 years of minimum wage employment. The Committee recommended that we support this definition with additional research.

The following definition is provided by a study conducted by the Brookings Institute: those employed three years at the statutory minimum wage, which will be included in the 2006/07 WIA 15% Solicitation for Proposal.

Partnership Applications

The Committee recommends that successful applications will be those submitted on behalf of partnerships and the score for this Section should be weighted accordingly. The following language is proposed for the 2006/07 SFP.

Creating effective partnerships is a key element of any workforce development system and is an essential component of this SFP. Emphasis will be placed on those applications submitted on behalf of partnerships. Applicants are strongly encouraged to cooperate with local partners and where feasible consider submitting unified proposals. It is the intent that, to the greatest extent possible, local partnerships be formed for this project between Local Workforce Investment Boards, state/local agencies that serve the targeted groups, advocacy groups, faith-based and community based organizations, training providers, business and economic development groups. Applicants must demonstrate that a high level of coordination already exists or that linkages are in the process of being established.

Demonstrated Coordination with local boards

Committee recommends that clarification be provided to more clearly define what is meant by “demonstrate coordination with local boards.” The following language is proposed for the 2006/07 SFP.

Describe how your organization has successfully established linkages with the LWIA. Include any actions you have taken to collaborate with the LWIA and any formal or informal agreements that are in place.

Describe the roles and responsibilities that the LWIA will perform in conjunction with this proposal. A listing of the LWIAs is available on the EDD website at www.edd.ca.gov/wiarep/wialoc.htm.

It is the intent of this SFP to fund projects that ensure the non-duplication of services and the sustainability of the proposed activities once funding under this grant ceases. Describe how each provider identified in the Resource Utilization Chart will contribute to the goals of the project, ensure non-duplication of services and provide future sustainability.

Definition of Employer

The Committee recommends that the SFP provide a definition of “employer.” They also recommend for the purposes of evaluating proposals, weight be added to those applications that include partnerships with employers that have vacancies for which the participants are being trained and/or skills developed. The following language is proposed for the SFP.

Describe the employer involvement in the planning and implementation of the project. Describe any partnerships with employers that have vacancies for which the participants are being trained and/or skills are being developed. Employers include business, industry, labor/trade associations or any other public, private non-profit or private for-profit organization that will be employing workers through this project.

Target Industries

The Committee recommends that applications targeting the following industries: leisure and hospitality, wholesale and retail, educational and health services, should be awarded bonus points. Applications for other industries can be submitted, but will not receive the bonus points. The following language is included in the SFP.

Research indicates that prime age workers, 25 to 54, become “stuck” in minimum wage jobs in leisure and hospitality industries, wholesale and retail industries, and educational and health services industries. Projects that focus on these industries will receive 5 bonus points. Other industries where minimum wage earners are predominate may also be targeted, however bonus points will not be awarded.

Cash / In-Kind Contributions

The Committee recommended that a specific minimum amount of matching funds not be required. Recognizing that that these are seed monies, meant to provide incentive, points should be awarded to those applications that do provide cash/in-kind match. The amount of bonus points should be awarded on a sliding scale to provide proper incentive and the narrative should clearly identify the strategies that they will use to sustain it beyond the life of the WIA funds. The following language is proposed for use in the SFP.

Projects that can demonstrate a non-WIA cash and/or in-kind match of 20 to 30 percent will be rewarded 3 bonus points. Match greater than 30 percent will be rewarded 6 bonus points.

All cash/in-kind match must be documented with a letter of commitment verifying the match and be included as an attachment to the proposal. The commitment letter must contain a contact person and telephone number.

It is the intent of this SFP to fund projects that ensure the non-duplication of services and the sustainability of the proposed activities once funding under this grant ceases. Describe how each provider identified in the Resource Utilization Chart will contribute to the goals of the project, ensure non-duplication of services and provide future sustainability.

Performance Goals

The Committee recommended that this funding category be identified as a demonstration project and that specific performance goals be established for it. The following language is proposed for use in the SFP.

The Advancing Minimum Wage Worker Category will be designated as demonstration projects and will have unique performance outcomes. Complete the Performance Goals Matrix for each of the performance goals identified below.

Performance Goal	Performance Level
1. Earnings	80 percent of the participants should increase their earnings by the end of the project.
2. Entry into Demonstrated Career Path	Participants will successfully enter into a career path/occupation with demonstrated upward mobility.
3. Occupational and/or Basic Skill Attainment	Participants will increase educational and/or occupational skill attainment in one or more functional areas such as nationally recognized standards for adult education and literacy programs, or basic education or occupational skills.
4. Benefits	Participants will become employed into jobs with benefits such as medical and sick leave.

Presentation and Discussion – Labor Market Information

This issue was given to the Committee by the State Board, and the Committee recently selected it as one of its top priorities during its strategic planning session. This item will include presentations by Janet Maglinte from the California Regional Economies Project and Bonnie Graybill of EDD's Labor Market Information Division (LMID). The purpose of the presentation is to inform the members of the work of the California Regional Economies Project (CREP) and LMID and its use as a tool for local planning efforts.

The Committee will discuss the development and content of the information and form recommendations on how the Committee might support and/or improve its use throughout the workforce system.

Action – Policy Framework for Strategic Partnerships in Workforce Investment

Action Requested

Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Targeted Resources Committee approve this Model Policy Framework for Strategic Partnerships in Workforce Investment.

The development of this framework resulted from the work of the California Workforce Investment Board's (CWIB) Special Committee on Targeting Resources and Life Long Learning. The Committees recognized a need for a model framework that local and regional partners could utilize to more effectively seize opportunities that enhance the competitive advantage of their region and address the needs of employers and workers.

In response to this, the staff to the Special Committees conducted an in-depth literature review to identify tested and proven strategies and approaches for responding to the demands of industry for a trained and skilled workforce. This document proposes a framework derived from best practices, lessons learned, effective planning and collaborations among a variety of state and local partnerships related to workforce investment.

The action of the Committee will be to form a recommendation approving the Framework and discuss its use and application in Committee based initiatives.

Framework for Strategic Partnerships in Workforce Investment

Background

Collaboration has become the operative word in many project initiatives, which seek to identify innovative ways to address the ever-changing needs of the demand-driven economy. In California, there are many examples of successful local and regional collaborations. However, there is a need to further transform and build California's workforce investment system through strategic partnerships that contribute to the overall development of a seamless, efficient, and effective enterprise.

The development of this framework resulted from the work of the California Workforce Investment Board's (CWIB) Special Committee on Targeting Resources and Life Long Learning. The Committees recognized a need for a model framework that local and regional partners could utilize to more effectively seize opportunities that enhance the competitive advantage of their region and address the needs of employers and workers.

In response to this, the staff to the Special Committees conducted an in-depth literature review to identify tested and proven strategies and approaches for responding to the demands of industry for a trained and skilled workforce. This document proposes a framework derived from best practices, lessons learned, effective planning and collaborations among a variety of state and local partnerships related to workforce investment.

Purpose

The framework supports the Governor's vision to develop a demand-driven, locally based workforce investment system throughout the State that is preparing workers for careers in the industries and sectors that are most vital to the State's economic health and growth. The Framework will help to guide the development of a skilled and productive workforce that allows workers to transition among occupations, industries and careers, through lifelong skills learning and advancement as the State's economy evolves.¹

¹ California's Strategic Two-Year Plan, I., page 6.

Forming Effective Strategic Partnership

Environment:

The first factor in forming strategic partnerships is assessing the existing environmental climate in a local or regional area. This assessment will provide insight into the existing nature of partnerships in the community. It will also identify opportunities and difficulties in forming strategic partnerships. The optimal collaborative environment promotes the development of common goals, understanding, trust, mutual respect and the ability to compromise.

Forming the Partnership:

The initial impetus to develop a strategic partnership can come from any element (workforce intermediary) of the local or regional system. The role of the workforce intermediary is to challenge existing organizations and systems to redefine whom they serve and how they do business through the forging of new partnerships and capacity building.

For a strategic initiative to achieve real impact it is necessary to involve all those invested in the common goal of developing a healthy economy and a skilled workforce. Potential strategic partners may include: Local Workforce Investment Boards, organized labor, economic development entities, business and industry, K-12 schools, community college districts, adult education providers, One-Stop Centers, Regional Occupational Centers/Programs and community based organizations.

Together, partners can better identify emerging and growth industries; align curriculum to the needs of employers; identify the underserved population; effectively and efficiently target regional resources; and develop pipelines between K-16 and business and industry.

Resources:

Federal funding reductions are motivating local and regional partnership to maximize available resources, experience, and knowledge within communities. An assessment of current and potential resources must be completed to assure effective targeting and sustainability of any actions taken by the partnership.

Shared Vision:

Partners should agree upon the mission, goals, and strategies that will be used to achieve the shared vision. The partnerships should reflect an enterprise approach without losing sight of the mission of individual organizations. The development of concrete, attainable goals for accomplishing the share vision heightens enthusiasm, sustains momentum and leads to successful outcomes.

Partnership Structure:

An integral step in establishing a strategic partnership is developing an enterprise structure that identifies how the partnership will operate. The structure should facilitate:

- Information exchange
- Decision making
- Resource allocation
- Role clarification and responsibilities
- Conflict resolution
- Partner contribution and division of work
- Open and frequent communication.

Evaluation and Sustainability:

To create systemic change it is vital that solutions be sustainable. The partnership must stay focused on ensuring the enterprise is stable, adaptable and flexible to respond to the changing needs of the local and regional community. The partnership can sustain the effort by periodically reassessing the goals and strategies, and involving new members.

Ultimately, successful collaborations focus on changing the system. Members should recognize that effective collaborations require patience, trust, shared goals and the ability to be flexible in a dynamic environment.

Action Item – Coordination of 15% Grant Applications with Local Workforce Investment Boards

The Committee identified as a short-term goal during its strategic planning, the issue of requiring WIA 15% grant applications to be coordinated with the local boards. The staff to the Committee proposed additional language around coordination and partnerships for use in the Governor's WIA 15% Discretionary 2006/07 Solicitation for Proposal. The action of the Committee will be to review this language and determine if it satisfies this goal or if additional language further strengthening this policy recommendation should be developed for use in future WIA 15% solicitations.

**Proposed Language for WIA 15% SFP
Local Board Coordination**

Creating effective partnerships is a key element of any workforce development system and is an essential component of this SFP. Emphasis will be placed on those applications submitted on behalf of partnerships. Applicants are strongly encouraged to cooperate with local partners and where feasible consider submitting unified proposals. It is the intent that, to the greatest extent possible, local partnerships be formed for this project between Local Workforce Investment Boards, state/local agencies that serve the targeted groups, advocacy groups, faith-based and community based organizations, training providers, business and economic development groups. Applicants must demonstrate that a high level of coordination already exists or that linkages are in the process of being established.

Describe how your organization has successfully established linkages with the LWIA. Include any actions you have taken to collaborate with the LWIA and any formal or informal agreements that are in place. Describe the roles and responsibilities that the LWIA will perform in conjunction with this proposal. A listing of the LWIAs is available on the EDD website at www.edd.ca.gov/wiarep/wialoc.htm.

It is the intent of this SFP to fund projects that ensure the non-duplication of services and the sustainability of the proposed activities once funding under this grant ceases. Describe how each provider identified in the Resource Utilization Chart will contribute to the goals of the project, ensure non-duplication of services and provide future sustainability.

Public Comment

Next Steps

Other Business that May Come Before the Committee